Exhibit B

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
Petition of ACS of Anchorage, Inc. Pursuant to	)	
Section 10 of the Communications Act of 1934, as	)	WC Docket No. 05-281
Amended, for Forbearance from Sections 251(c)(3)	)	
And 252(d)(1) in the Anchorage LEC Study Area	)	

STATEMENT OF RANDALL W. POOR

1. I am currently the Alaska Communication Systems Central District General Manager. My geographic area of responsibility includes the entire service area of ACS of Anchorage, Inc. ("ACS"). I have numerous years of telephone operations experience beginning as a technician in 1974 and later a foreman in 1978 with Cordova Telephone. From 1983 to 1986, I worked as a splicer with Newberry. In 1986, I joined ACS's predecessor company, the Anchorage Telephone Utility, where I worked as a technician, foreman, general foreman, and manager.

2. My job responsibilities include network deployment and maintenance activities by ACS within the Anchorage study area. Based on my management duties and my work at ACS network deployment sites, I am familiar with ACS's network. Additionally, my job responsibilities include an awareness of and routine contact with the network of ACS's largest competitor, General Communication, Inc. ("GCI"). I have monitored GCI's deployment of its local exchange telephone plant and operations both as an ACS general foreman and as Central District General Manager. Other individuals under my supervision have also monitored GCI's network evolution and have reported their findings to me.

3. Since 2004, my team and I have observed GCI's deployment of cable telephony technology throughout the Anchorage study area. For customers that GCI serves using its own Digital Local Phone Service ("DLPS") or other loop facilities, GCI installs its own subloop, Network Interface Device ("NID"), and any inside wiring elements that are not controlled by the customer. Where GCI does not use ACS UNE loop, it does not need unbundled access to ACS's subloop, NID, or inside wiring. In the older buildings in Anchorage, the demarcation point has been moved to the minimum point of entry. Thus, all inside wiring, including that of MDUs, is controlled by the customer, and not ACS. For its cable telephony customers, GCI installs a distinctive NID on the exterior of service premises that is clearly visible from the street. My team and I have seen GCI's voice-enabling NIDs installed on customer premises throughout the Anchorage study area.

4. I have also seen evidence of GCI's use of wireless local loops ("WLLs") to serve both residences and businesses in Anchorage. For example, on or about November 5, 2005, I noticed GCI placing a small flat dish on customer premises at the Diamond Mall, which is located in the area served by ACS's South Wire Center. At approximately that same time, I observed GCI's WLL antenna on a home in the Bayshore Subdivision which is also served by ACS's South Wire Center. Additionally, on or about January 2006, I documented one of GCI's WLL antennas on a coffee shop on Tudor Street, near Bragraw. [1] This premises is located in the area served by ACS's Central Wire Center. Based on my observations at these locations, GCI has installed these WLL antennas at locations where constructing facilities may be difficult, such

[1] *See* Exhibit B-1 attached hereto.

as installing lines under a vast parking lot in the Diamond Mall area. GCI appears to be able to deploy WLLs to serve both residences and businesses.

5. I also have experience with ACS's network deployments in buildings housing multiple dwelling units ("MDUs") in Anchorage. Most older residential MDUs in Anchorage typically have four to six units. In an MDU, GCI claims it is technically capable of serving up to eight lines with its cable facilities.[2] Therefore, GCI has the technical capability to serve customers in most older MDUs using GCI's cable plant. Further, any issues that GCI may have had in installing cable facilities into older MDUs in the past appear to have been resolved. I have seen several older MDUs where GCI now provides cable service to customers by installing cable along the outside of the building or gaining entry through the basement of the building. Therefore, GCI does not need access to ACS's entry conduit. In recent years, a relative shortage of land in Anchorage has encouraged higher density construction. Most newer MDUs have 16-20 units. Whether a carrier is a CLEC or an ILEC, the provider must obtain permission from the MDU property owner to gain access to space in the building's telecommunications closet and conduit. In these MDUs, all carriers have an equal opportunity to become the exclusive voice provider.

6. I am aware of several MDUs and other buildings being served by GCI either with copper or fiber facilities. Some examples of this are the Diamond Center Mall, the Diamond Center Hotel, and the Alaska USA Federal Credit Union buildings. The exclusive facilities that

---

[2] *See In the Matter of Petition of ACS of Anchorage, Inc. Pursuant to Section 10 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, for Forbearance from Sections 251(c)(3) and 252(d)(1) in the Anchorage LEC Study Area*, Opposition of General Communication, Inc., WC Docket No. 05-281 (Redacted Version), at 27 ("GCI Opposition").

GCI has deployed on Elmendorf Air Force Base are all used to connect to MDUs that constitute base military housing.

7. GCI contends that ACS has denied GCI access to conduit in certain properties in Anchorage.[3] In fact, the opposite occurred at each of these three properties. Without notice or permission, GCI accessed ACS's conduit in newly built construction at the Peanut Farm, the Alaska Dance Theater, and Bailey's Furniture in an attempt to establish exclusive access to these businesses. In each of these three instances, ACS obtained permission from the property owners to construct entrance conduit for ACS's facilities. This construction was done at ACS's own cost, and I agree with GCI's statement that "it is quite costly to construct new entrance conduit."[4] GCI could have similarly requested permission from the property owner to install its own conduit at GCI's own cost. Or GCI could have requested access to the conduit from ACS once ACS had installed telecommunications facilities there, an option that ACS does not have with respect to buildings that GCI serves exclusively. However, in each case, GCI installed its cable facilities into ACS's conduit without ACS's consent, even before ACS had completed construction of the conduit and before ACS installed its own facilities into the conduit. GCI's actions deprived ACS of access to ACS's own conduit. Thus, GCI mischaracterizes the circumstances in which ACS demanded that GCI remove its facilities from ACS's conduit.

8. As GCI mentions, it currently serves the customers at the Bailey's Furniture location. In that case, ACS constructed a conduit in response to a customer service request for T-1 and local lines. Subsequently, GCI placed either its fiber or coaxial cable in our conduit, and the customer cancelled our service. GCI was able to meet customer demand for service to this

---

3 *See* GCI Opposition at 32.

4 *Id*. at 31.

location, including T-1 and local lines without need for ACS UNEs in this location.[5] Similarly, the fact that GCI serves the Alaska USA Federal Credit Union building wholly with fiber demonstrates that GCI has the ability to install and provide T-1s where it wants.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ *Randall W. Poor*
Randall W. Poor
600 Telephone Avenue
MS 60
Anchorage, AK 99503-6091

[5] The fact that GCI has offered to allow ACS to use the inner duct or copper is irrelevant because GCI, and not ACS, now provides service to the customer.

EXHIBIT B-1

GCI's WLL antenna on a coffee shop in Anchorage